THE Reconstructionist

Vol. X November 3, 1944 Heshvan 17, 5705 No. 13

EDITORIALS
- *"The Traditional American Policy" Regarding Palestine*
- *The War Emergency Conference*
- *Dumbarton Oaks*

FAITH — *By Abraham J. Heschel*

PREPARING FOR THE JEWISH COMMONWEALTH — *By Samuel Dinin*

DISCUSSION ON THE FOREGOING PAPER

BOOK NOTES — *By Alexander Brody*

REALITIES AND VALUES

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: Mordecai M. Kaplan

Associate Chairman: Ira Eisenstein
Managing Editor: Eugene Kohn

Associate Editors: Israel S. Chipkin, Samuel Dinin, Abraham G. Duker, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Theodore H. Gaster, Jacob S. Golub, Bernard Heller, Philip Houtz, Samuel G. Kohs, Milton R. Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke Milton Steinberg, Max Wiener.

Contributing Editors: Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Shlomo Bardin, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfield, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Mortimer J. Cohen, Miriam R. Ephraim, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Emanuel Green, Max Kadushin, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, I. D. Minzberg, Edward T. Sandrow, Simon Shetzer, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Jacob L. Weinstein.

Secretary: Hannah L. Goldberg

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. Heschel is Associate Professor of Jewish Philosophy at the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, and author of several books, among them, "Maimonides," "Die Prophetik," "Studies in Gabirol's Metaphysik," "The Quest for Certainty in Saadia's Philosophy."

Alexander Brody is an instructor at City College, New York City.

The first issue of THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST NEWS for this season will be ready for distribution soon. Orders for copies will be filled upon request. THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST NEWS is available free of charge to all those interested in the progress of Reconstructionism.

FOR ALL GROUP STUDY WORK
USE
A SYLLABUS OF THE PHILOSOPHY AND PROGRAM
OF RECONSTRUCTIONISM

A ten unit Course of Study, complete with outlines, questions, subjects for discussion, projects for action, and recommended readings.
Twenty-five cents per copy.

With each issue of the
THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST
we have specially prepared
STUDY AIDS
Related to the material contained in that issue of the Magazine.
These study aids are distributed free upon request

The Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc.
15 W. 86th St., New York 24, N. Y.
Please send me ..... copies of the Syllabus at 25 cents per capy.
Please send me ..... copies of the Study Aids.
NAME .....
ADDRESS .....

THE
Reconstructionist

Vol. X November 3, 1944 Heshvan 17, 5705 No. 13

EDITORIALS

"THE TRADITIONAL AMERICAN POLICY" REGARDING PALESTINE

THE nearer we approach the victorious end of the war and the settlement of the political problems that must follow, the more the political situation with respect to a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine improves, at least as far as American interest in the problem is concerned. It was a great triumph for American Zionism when both the Republican and Democratic parties adopted planks in their platforms favorable to Zionist aims. It was a further victory when the Republican candidate for President, Thomas Dewey, promised, if elected, "to have our government working together with Great Britain to achieve this great objective." The objective referred to was that formulated in the Republican platform which urged that: "in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth."

But the climax was capped by President Roosevelt's message to the Z.O.A. Convention. In this message he expressed his satisfaction with the Palestine plank of the Democratic platform and declared that it represented "the traditional American policy" and was "in keeping with the spirit of the four freedoms." That plank favors "the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth." The President pledged that efforts would be made "to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as possible." The Zionist issue is thus withdrawn from party politics and Zionist aims in regard to a Jewish commonwealth are recognized as the American policy with regard to Palestine.

We wonder now whether the American Council for Judaism will go so far in its isolationism as to declare the President of the United States, the Presidential candidate of the Republican Party, and all who participated in writing the platforms of the two major parties or who endorse those platforms, to be un-American in sentiment. There is an old Yiddish saying to the effect that when two people tell you that you are drunk, you had better go to sleep. Surely, the American Council for Judaism, after having been virtually told by the leaders of both ma-

jor political parties in America and by all those who endorse the two party platforms that they are under an illusion in thinking Americanism and Zionism to be incompatible, ought not expose themselves any longer to ridicule by pretending that advocacy of the Jewish Commonwealth is un-American. Let them go to sleep for a while until they can view the American scene soberly in the light of reality and can clear their minds of the phantom fears that haunt their delirium.

As for the Zionists, let them take heart from these events but let them not indulge in premature celebration. The way to victory has been cleared of some of its obstacles, but the victory has not yet been achieved. The next step is to see that the Commonwealth Resolution is taken out of committee and finally passed by Congress. The prospects for the success of such action are excellent. In a reply to a letter from Senator Wagner inquiring as to the War Department's present attitude to the passage of the Resolution, Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, wrote in part: ". . . I do feel that the military considerations which led to my previous action in opposing the passage of this resolution are not as strong a factor now as they were then. *In my judgment, political considerations now outweigh the military, and the issue should be determined upon the political rather than the military basis.*" (Italics ours.) This gives the sponsors of the Resolution the green light. In all probability the Resolution will be passed.

But what then? That will not yet give us the Commonwealth. Then comes the problem of backing the efforts of our government in bringing the influence of America to bear on British policy with regard to Palestine and on the policy of all the nations that will have a voice in determining Palestine's status after the war. This calls for unflagging efforts by Zionists in the political field and the field of public relations and propaganda, led by the American Zionist Emergency Council and participated in with disciplined loyalty by the general Zionist membership. We have still a good way to travel on the road to victory, but from now on we may advance with more confident steps because we have already cleared so many hurdles.

THE WAR EMERGENCY CONFERENCE

BEGINNING November 10 in New York, and continuing in Atlantic City, a War Emergency Conference will convene, representing the Jews of 58 nations. The delegates come at the invitation of the World Jewish Congress. Dr. Nahum Goldmann, speaking in Palestine, listed the following as some of the problems to be discussed: whether to accept as a *fait accompli* the obliteration of organized Jewish life in Europe, or to work for its restoration; whether to press for restoration of personal or of collective rights for the Jews of Europe; the restitution of confiscated Jewish property; the problem of laying claim, for the Jewish people, to property of murdered Jews; punishment of those guilty of crimes against Jews; representation for Jews in international organizations like UNRRA.

That such a world conference needs to be called there can be no doubt. The Jewish people has suffered far beyond its share during this war, and unless it gather its forces and make its demands, it will be neglected by the victorious powers. Most observers of world events now regard as a truism that the peace conferences are taking place before hostilities cease. Now, therefore, is the time for world Jewry to rally its scattered and decimated forces, and think through the problems of the Jewish future.

The question naturally arises: Who will represent the Jews of the various countries? The answer is as satisfactory as any answer can be under the present circumstances. Wherever there is one central Jewish organization, that organization sends its delegates to the world conference. From Palestine come eight delegates designated by the *Vaad Leumi,* representing every shade of opinion within the *yishuv.* Practically all the South American countries are represented in this way. Those European countries whose Jewish life has been shattered by the war will be represented by leading Jews, now resident here or in other free countries, who have been previously identified with the Jewish World Congress movement.

How will American Jewry be represented? Again we come to the vexing question of the relation of the American Jewish Conference to its constituent bodies. Theoretically, the American Jewish Conference ought to represent American Jewry. Actually, however, the Conference never received a mandate from its delegates to enter into any international body. If groups within the Conference had attempted to commit the Conference in any way, that body might have suffered an even greater schism than the one caused by the Jewish Commonwealth resolution. Hence, the American Jewish Congress is tacitly called upon to act in behalf of American Jewry in "foreign affairs." On the other hand, the American Jewish Congress has also no mandate, none from American Jewry, and none from the Conference.

The dilemma: Shall American Jewry wait until it has perfected its democratic machinery before calling—or even participating in—a war emergency conference, or shall it proceed, imperfectly organized, but at least, honorably and intelligently motivated? The American Jewish Congress and the Conference have decided on the latter course; and arrangements have been made whereby Congress selects the American delegates, and the American Jewish Conference sends *observers,* who work work closely with the delegates.

Objections will undoubtedly be heard; American Jews may as well prepare for them. Isolationists within and without the American Jewish Conference will stand on technicalities; they will raise questions of jurisdiction. In truth, however, they will be paraphrasing—but not literally declaring—their belief that Jews have no right to hold international conferences. The Anglo-Jewish Association, in England, has already announced to the world that the English delegates to the War Conference do not represent English Jewry.

Objections of this kind cannot be taken seriously unless they are accompanied by serious proposals for a more democratic method of representation. Otherwise such objections must be seen as sheer obstructionism.

We do not for one moment retreat from our hitherto held position, namely, that American Jewry must, as soon as possible, rethink the entire question of the American Jewish Conference. But we are not so doctrinaire as to deny, in the face of hard and bitter realities, that the forthcoming War Conference is necessary even though it is not sufficiently representative.

We extend a heartfelt welcome to the delegates coming to our shores, and extend our sincerest best wishes for a harmonious and fruitful conference.

DUMBARTON OAKS

"I LIVE in constant dread," once said Wendell Willkie, "that the war may end before the people of this world have come to a common understanding of what they are

fighting for and what they hope for after the war is over." The general apathy with which the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have been received by the American public may well cause one to fear for the peace and security of the post-war world. The four great powers of the United Nations, through their official representatives, have made public to their peoples a tentative plan for a world organization, designed for the maintenance of peace and security. But the average American citizen seems much more interested in which team wins the World Series than in the Dumbarton Oaks plan.

In view of the fact that both President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey have expressed general approval of the plan, discussion of it can take place in a non-political spirit. There is danger that this very fact may contribute to the loss of interest in this problem, despite its supreme importance. The withdrawal of the subject from the arena of partisan politics should not lead to indifference but to a more rational and disinterested discussion of it. Every American citizen, alive to the perils that face the next and all future generations if wars are not eliminated, should feel it as his sacred duty to study carefully the Dumbarton Oaks plan and all other suggestions that may be made to assure mankind a substantial measure of peace. We feel that it will be in the public interest to present here a brief outline and discussion of the four-power proposal, if only to awaken or sharpen the interest of our readers in this all-important subject.

Membership in the new organization will be open to all "peace-loving" states. Its principal organs will be a General Assembly, a Security Council, an International Court of Justice, and a Secretariat. Every state will have representatives in the Assembly. The Assembly is not to be a legislative body, but rather a deliberative and consultative body. It will not be able to make laws, orders or decrees; its chief function will be to consider matters relating to disarmament, regulation of armaments, and international peace and security, and to make recommendations to the Security Council. The Assembly will be able to propose, but not to dispose.

The Security Council is to consist of representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the U.S.S.R., and China; in due course, France will join these powers. Each of these states will have permanent seats in the Council. In addition, the Assembly will designate six states for temporary seats, to serve for a two-year term. Primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security will rest on the Council. All members of the organization will be bound to carry out the decisions of the Council. The question of voting procedure in the Council has been left open for the present.

If two or more states should find themselves involved in a dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the peace and security of the world, they will be obliged to seek a solution through negotiation, arbitration, mediation, or adjudication by the International Court of Justice. If these means fail, the matter will go before the Security Council, which will have power to take any measures necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Council will have the power to determine what diplomatic, economic or other measures, not involving the use of armed force, should be employed to give effect to its decisions. It may call upon the other states to use the measures designated as appropriate. Among the measures may be complete or partial interruption of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communi-

cation, and the severance of diplomatic and economic relations.

If these measures be deemed inadequate, the Council may employ force (air, naval or land forces), and may resort to demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by the military forces of the members of the organization.

Each state will need to make available to the Council such armed forces as may be agreed upon; and the agreement on this subject should be negotiated as soon as possible. There should be made available immediately to the Council air-force contingents of the national states.

Action required to carry out the decisions of the Council shall be taken by all members of the organization or by the members designated by the Council.

A military staff committee will be attached to the Council for advice and assistance. This committee will be composed of the chiefs of staff of the permanent members of the Council.

Regional arrangements may be made where measures can best be handled on a regional basis.

The organization will have among its duties the solution of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems, and the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Responsibility for this function shall rest with the Assembly, and in an economic and social council, if its establishment is authorized by the Security Council. The economic and social council will consist of eighteen representatives elected by the General Assembly.

While the voting procedure in the Security Council was left open, the voting procedure in the Assembly was agreed upon, and is to be as follows: each member of the organization is to have one vote; important decisions should be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting, other matters will be decided by a simple majority vote.

The foregoing represents the important points of the plan. Hardly a single suggestion incorporated in the proposal can be dogmatically asserted to be beyond dispute. Merely for the purpose of opening up avenues of thought, we wish to call attention to the contribution made to the subject by Grenville Clark, eminent lawyer, in *The New York Times* of October 15. He points out that, since the concept of sovereign equality was employed in the formulation of the plan, it was necessary to give each state a single vote; but at the same time it was necessary to curb the powers of the Assembly where equality of voting strength is reflected, and vest in the Council the real powers enjoyed by the organization. On the one hand, then, there is to be a powerless Assembly, and on the other a powerful Council dominated by the big powers, who will have permanent places.

Mr. Clark proposes instead a strong Assembly, with a Council set up to execute the policies fixed by the Assembly. But this raises the question of representation in the Assembly. Mr. Clark would have representation, in part, determined in accordance with population. He suggests that the United States, the U.S.S.R., the British Commonwealth and Empire, and China should each have fifty votes; France should have twenty-six; this would give the five great powers 226 out of a total of 354 votes. The remaining 128 votes should be apportioned among the other states, one vote for each two million persons, up to fourteen million, and one vote for each five million in excess of this population, with the proviso that each state should have at least one vote.

Representatives should vote as individuals and decisions should be taken by majority vote.

Mr. Clark's suggestions merit serious consideration. For one thing, they go a

step further than does the Dumbarton Oaks proposal in breaking up the traditional concept of inviolate state sovereignty. If representatives will vote as individuals, just as members of Congress do, and not in state-blocs, it may well be that they will feel their international obligations almost as keenly as they feel their national obligations. But in this direction one may go a step further and ask why the representatives, or some of them, shall not be elected directly by the people, instead of appointed by their governments? If this were done, the people participating in the elections may be made to feel that they are members of an international organization in which they are directly represented.

One might also question the wisdom of the bi-cameral system proposed at Dumbarton Oaks. If the problem of representation is solved, why not have a single chamber of representatives, with executive powers vested in a committee answerable at all times to the Assembly, like the ministerial system of the British Parliament? Political scientists do not generally favor a bi-cameral legislature.

We do not have any ready-made answers to the multitude of problems involved; but we do feel that it is every man's duty to give his best thought to the problems, and to try to meet them with intelligence, courage and foresight.

REALITIES AND VALUES

THE NATIONAL PRO-HISTADRUT Conference called by the League for Labor Palestine was designed to reveal the contribution of the Histadrut to the labor movement and to the development of a cooperative commonwealth. The list of sponsors which appears on the invitation to the conference includes such names as Sir Norman Angel, Albert Einstein, William Green, Philip Murray, Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Senator Robert F. Wagner, James P. Warbasse, and Orson Welles. The presence of these names on the sponsoring committee is an index of the significance which advanced social thinkers see in the achievements of the Histadrut. If, in the period of reconstruction after the war, the world is to avoid the debacle caused by predatory capitalism as well as the agony of social revolution motivated by class hatred, more cooperative ways of living must be found. The experience of labor in Palestine, where Jewish workers had to solve their social and economic problems for themselves without either the aid or the interference of an entrenched capitalism, should prove instructive. The place where the conference was held is appropriate. It is the New School for Social Research. The importance of the Palestine cooperative movement to all who are seeking a better social order is thus emphasized.

▼

SOME YEARS AGO, IN OCTOBER 1939 to be exact, we published an article on Negro-Jewish relations in Detroit. The article was written by William I. Boxerman, at that time Executive Secretary of the Jewish Community Council of Detroit. It told of the activities of the Council to improve those relations. We are glad to learn of the continued interest of the Council in the problem. It has recently sponsored, jointly with the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), a series of studies of "Intergroup Conflicts in Detroit" by the sociology department of Wayne University. The results of that study cannot be detailed here. We want only to congratulate both sponsors for having initiated this project and the University for having conducted it. Such studies by disinterested students of sociology under competent scholarly direction can be most helpful toward achieving a rational

approach and a just solution to a problem that is too often bedeviled by prejudice and rancor.

▼

IN OUR LAST ISSUE WE CALLED attention to the need of participation by private agencies in the task of rehabilitating the returning veteran and integrating him into the life of the community. We are therefore happy to announce that this need has been realized and is receiving the earnest attention of a special committee, the National Committee on Service to Veterans under the auspices of the National Social Work Council. Fourteen national organizations are represented in the Committee. They include Catholic, Protestant, Jewish and non-sectarian associations. The Jewish organizations represented are the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and the National Jewish Welfare Board. The latter has recently circulated the first pamphlet of a series being prepared by the National Committee. It is entitled, "Community Service for Veterans" and advises local communities how to organize to help the returning servicemen. Jewish organizations should give every encouragement to this movement and should particularly assume responsibility for helping *Jewish* veterans to re-establish themselves not only in civilian life generally but in the life of the Jewish community. Our returning servicemen should be made to feel that their fellow Jews care about them and that they themselves are needed and wanted as Jews.

▼

THE POWER OF SYMBOLS TO evoke heroic action is demonstrated every day on the battle field. The tearing down of an enemy flag and the hoisting in its place of one's own national emblem is such a heroic act. How many Jews have sacrificed their lives to save a *sefer torah* from pollution! A recent item of war news from Yugoslavia is packed with dramatic symbolism. It appears that Marshal Tito's right-hand man is a certain Yehuda Pyade, a scion of an old Sephardic family, at one time vice-president of the Yugoslav Committee of National Liberation. In the course of the guerilla warfare conducted by the Yugoslavs, he and his men were able to recapture 100 scrolls of the Torah. These have since been handed over, in impressive ceremonies, to rabbis who had enlisted in the patriot army. The Torah which the Nazis condemned and sought to destroy has been saved; it "will not die but live and declare the works of the Lord."

▼

AMERICAN CIVILIANS ARE AGAIN being asked to "sacrifice" themselves for the war. This time they are requested to stay away from certain vacation centers like Miami, Hot Springs and Lake Placid. Mind, they are not being called upon to give up their precious winter vacations, to stay home and sell bonds; would they, please, pretty please, only choose some other warm and sunny spot? Knowing the hardihood of our young men in France, Holland, Germany and the Philippines, we are quite sure that their compatriots back home are sturdy enough to survive the change from Miami to Tampa.

▼

WE HAVE AVOIDED PERSONALITIES in the political campaign, and have tried to hew to the line of principles and objectives; but sometimes it is impossible to make a point without mentioning a name. The point we want to make is: that the humane and merciful rescue of a few hundred refugees should not be made political capital. Mr. Bricker has condemned the President for having turned over Oswego to 1,000 refugees, after Congress had failed to revise the

(*Continued on page* 24)

Faith

By ABRAHAM JOSHUA HESCHEL

In the Absence of Faith

ONE of the greatest shocks that we experience in our childhood comes with the discovery that our deeds and desires are not always approved by our fellow-men, that the world is not mere food for our delight. The resistance we encounter, the refusals we meet with, open our eyes to the existence of a world outside ourselves. But, growing older and stronger, we gradually recover from that shock, forget its dolorous lesson and apply most of our ingenuity to enforcing our will on nature and men. No recollection of our past experience is capable of upsetting the arrogance that guides the traffic in our mind. Dazzled by the brilliant achievements of the intellect in science and technique, we have been deluded into believing that we are the masters of the earth and our will the ultimate judge of what is right and wrong. However, the universe is not a waif and life is not a derelict. Man is neither the lord of the universe nor even the master of his own destiny. Our life is not our own property but a possession of God. And it is this divine ownership that makes life a sacred thing.

The world that we have long considered to be ours has exploded in our hands, and a stream of guilt and misery has been unloosed, which leaves no conscience unblemished. Will this flood of wretchedness sweep away our monstrous conceit? Will we comprehend that the sense for the sacred is as vital to us as the light of the sun? The enjoyment of beauty, possession, and safety in civilized society depends upon man's sense for the sacredness of life, upon his reverence for this spark of light in the darkness of selfishness. Permit this spark to be quenched, and the darkness falls upon us like thunder.

We are impressed by the towering buildings of New York City. Yet not the rock of Manhattan nor the steel of Pittsburgh but the law that came from Sinai is their ultimate foundation. The true foundation upon which our cities stand is a handful of spiritual ideas. All of our life hangs by a thread — the faithfulness of man to the will of God.

The course in which human life moves is, like the orbit of heavenly bodies, an ellipse, not a circle. We are attached to two centers: to the focus of our self and to the focus of what is beyond our self. Even the intelligence is driven by two forces — by a force that comes as an instinct from within and by a force that comes with ideals from without. The inner force generates the impulse to acquire, to enjoy, to possess; the outer force arouses an urge to respond, to yield, to give.

It seems as though we have arrived at a point in history, closest to instincts and remotest from ideals, where the self stands like a wall between God and man. It is the period of a divine eclipse. We sail the seas, we count the stars, we split the atom, but never ask: Is there nothing but a dead universe and our reckless curiosity?

Primitive man's humble ear was alert to the inwardness of the world, while the modern man is presumptuous enough to claim that he has the sole monopoly over soul and spirit, that he is the only thing alive in the universe. A little crust of bread holds so much of goodness, of secret harmony, of tacit submission to purpose. Why should our minds be crowded by so much deceit, folly and supercilious vanity?

The Dawn of Wonder

But there is a dawn of wonder and surprise in our souls, when the things that surround us suddenly slip off the triteness with which we have endowed them, and their strangeness opens like a gap between them and our mind, a gap that no words can fill. How does it happen that I am using this pen and writing these lines? Who am I to scan the holy stars, to witness the settings of the sun, to have the service of the spring for my survival? How shall I ever reciprocate for breathing, thinking, for sight and hearing, for love and dreaming? Some delicate cognition weans us then from mistaking the benignity of the world for ownerlessness, its symbolic living for dull order.

What is the incense of self-esteem to him who tastes in all things the flavor of the utterly unknown, the fragrance of what is beyond our senses? There are neither skies nor oceans, neither birds nor trees—there are only signs of what can never be perceived. And all power and beauty are mere straws in the fire of a pure man's vision.

He who chooses a life of utmost striving for the utmost stake, the vital, matchless stake of God, feels as though the spirit of God comes to rest upon his lids—so close to his eyes and yet never seen. He who has ever been confronted with the ultimate and has realized that sun and stars and souls do not ramble in a vacuum will keep his heart in readiness for the hour when the world is entranced, and awaits a soul to breath in the mystery that all things exhale in their craving for salvation. For things are not mute. The stillness is full of demands. Out of the world comes a behest to instill into the air a rapturous song for God, to incarnate in the stones a message of humble beauty, and to instill a prayer for goodness in the hearts of all children.

Beliefs are hanging over our souls like stars, remote and guiding: the freedom of God is the spring of all things; the life of man can sometimes be a mirror that God holds before His face; the destiny of Israel is to remain clean amidst the mud of splendor and madness. The tenets shine through dark and dangerous ages. Their reflection can be seen in the ways of contemporaries whose life is like a fountain of conscience and memory in the desert of careless living.

Since those basic principles of Jewish life have moved into our mind, the wonder has never left our eyes. Heedfully we stare through the telescope of ancient rites lest we lose the sight of the promise of God, the perpetual brightness at the edge of our soul. Our mind has not kindled the flame, has not produced these principles. Still our thoughts glow with their light. What is the nature of this glow, of this faith? and how is it acquired?

Faith As Sensitiveness to the Transcendent

Faith is sensitiveness to what transcends nature, knowledge and will, awareness of the ultimate, alertness to the holy dimension of all reality.* Faith is a force in man, lying deeper than the stratum of reason and its nature cannot be defined in abstract, static terms. To have faith is not to infer the beyond from the wretched here, but to perceive the wonder that is here and to be stirred by the desire to integrate the self into the holy order of living. It is not a deduction but an intuition, not a form of knowledge, of being convinced without proof, but the attitude of mind toward ideas whose scope is wider than its own capacity to grasp.

Such alertness grows with the sense for the meaningful, for the marvel of matter, for the core of thoughts. It is begot-

* See A. Heschel, *The Holy Dimension, The Journal of Religion, XXIII* (1943), pp. 117-124.

ten in passionate love for the significance of all reality, in devotion to the ultimate meaning which is only God. By our very existence we are in dire need of meaning, and anything that calls for meaning is always an allusion to Him. We live by the certainty that we are not as dust in the wind, that our life is related to the ultimate, the meaning of all meanings. And the system of meanings that permeates the universe is like an endless flight of stairs. Even when the upper steps are beyond our sight, we constantly rise toward the distant goal.

Strange and scattered are the wells from which we draw the transport of faith. Some of us are sickened by the dismay over living constantly for naught, by the dread of an unprepared death; some are thrilled by the innocence of limbs and words, misused by our whims and sins and insolence. Others are charmed by the sanctity of living for His laws. Instead of indulging in jealousy, greed, in relishing themselves, there are men who keep their hearts alert to the stillness in which time rolls on and leaves us behind. It is only God who would never desert us, who sues for our devotion, audibly, constantly, persistently.

Foregoing beauty for goodness, power for love, grief for gratitude, entreating the Lord for help to understand our hopes, for strength to resist our fears, we shall receive a gentle sense for the holiness that permeates the air like a strangeness that cannot be removed. Crying out of the pitfall of our selfishness for purity of devotion will usher in the dawn of faith in the mist of honest tears. For those who are open to the wonder will not miss it. Faith is found in solicitude for faith, in an inner care for the wonder that is everywhere.

Highest in the list of virtues, this anxious caring extends not only to the moral sphere but to all realms of life, to oneself and to others, to words and to thoughts, to events and to deeds. Unawed by the prevailing narrowness of mind, it persists as an attitude toward the whole of reality; to hold small things great, to take light matters seriously, to think of the common and the passing from the aspect of the lasting.

Timid knocking at distant gates of silence, inquiring whether or not God is dwelling somewhere, the exuberant growth of evil notwithstanding, is not a move of faith. Only straight discovering in the nearest stone or tree, sound or thought, the shelter of His often desecrated goodness, the treasury of His waiting for man's heart to affiliate with His will—this is the rapture of faith. It is an echo to a pleading voice, a reply to the inconceivable in all beauty. The tumult of strife and envy, insidious selfishness, inflation of cruelty, is a poor setting for the plain unfolding of the Divine. Yet a force from beyond our conscience cries at the insolent haughtiness of man, reminding and admonishing that the wanton will fail in rebellion against the good. He who listens to this voice opens his life to the sight of the unseen in the desert of indifference.

Faith As a Mutual Relationship

Is faith just another feature of man's mentality, the self-effacement of curiosity, the asceticism of reason? No, it is not an inner, private quality that concerns the character of man alone, but rather the extension of man's love to what God may approve, a wave in the tide of His thoughts, rising to the dry and desolate shore of man's despair. Faith is real only when it is not one-sided but reciprocal. Man can rely on God, if God can rely on man. We may trust in Him because He trusts in us. Our trustworthiness for God is the measure of the integrity of our

faith. Thus faith is an awareness of Divine mutuality and companionship, a form of communion between God and man. It is not a psychical quality, something that exists in the mind only, but a force from the beyond.

Faith is not the clinging to a shrine, but the endless, tameless pilgrimage of hearts. Audacious longing, calling, calling, burning songs, daring thoughts, an impulse overwhelming the heart, usurping the mind—it is all a stalwart driving to the precious serving of Him who rings our hearts like a bell, wishing to enter our empty perishing life. What others call readiness to suffer, willingness to relinquish, is felt here as bestowal of joy, as granting of greatness. Is it a surrender to confide? Is it a sacrifice to believe? True, beliefs are not secured by demonstration nor impregnable to objection. But does goodness mean serving only as long as rewarding lasts? Towers are more apt to be shaken than graves. Insistent doubt, contest and frustration may stultify the trustworthy mind, may turn temples into shambles. But those of faith who plant sacred thoughts in the uplands of time, the secret gardeners of the Lord in mankind's desolate hopes, may slacken and tarry but rarely betray their vocation.

Faith is always exposed to failure. We often submit to the forces that draw us down to where a small desire seems to outweigh the noblest aspiration. There is the network of the false into which we easily slip. There is the enjoyment of the vile that vitiates the taste for the true. We must not cease to be vigilant, careful and anxious to keep our inner ear open to the holy.

Faith is not a languid attitude of resignation toward the chances of life, a fatalistic apotheosis of all events. To regard all that happens as workings of Providence is to deny human responsibility. We must not idolize history. This world is more frequently subject to the power of man than to the love of God.

Faith comes over us like a force urging for action. It often begins by pledging us to constancy of devotion, by committing us to the presence of God, and remains an affiliation for life, an allegiance involving restraint, submission, self-control and courage. Its power is revealed when man is able to exercise defiance in the face of adversity.

We cannot stem the tempest of evil by taking refuge in temples, by fervently adoring the restrained omnipotence of God. Our task is to act, not only to enjoy, to change not only to accept, to augment not only to discover the glory of God. And life is refulgent with possibilities of creating the good.

He whose soul is charged with awareness of God earns his inner livelihood by a passionate desire to pour his life into the eternal wells of love. What is it that makes us worthy of life, if not our compassion and ability to help? We do not exist for our own sake. Life would be preposterous if not for the love it confers.

Faith implies no denial of evil, no disregard of danger, no whitewashing of the abominable. He whose heart is given to faith is mindful of the obstructive and awry, of the sinister and pernicious. It is God's strange dominion over both good and evil on which he relies. But even this reliance is not an indefeasible bridge across ravines and precipices, a viaduct over the valley of death. To rely only on our faith would be idol worship. We have only the right to rely on God, on His love and mercy. Faith is not a mechanical insurance, but a dynamic, personal act, flowing between the heart of man and the love of God.

Yet life is not all action. Our body and soul, the sun and the air we breathe are not the products of our will. We receive more than we give. We find in nature

both motion and stillness, stir and tranquility, initiative and acquiesence. The attitude of faith is that the totality of being is not chaos but order, that there is often more dignity in acceptance than in rebellion. The man of faith will know when to consent and when to defy.

(*To be concluded in our next issue*)

Preparing for the Jewish Commonwealth*

By SAMUEL DININ**

OFFICIAL Zionist propaganda, in the interest of simplicity and directness and wide public appeal, has highlighted the role of Palestine as a haven of refuge, the role of Palestine in the War, the need of the Jewish people for a free and democratic Commonwealth of their own. But it has emphasized neither the meaning of Zionism for American Jewish life nor the relation of Palestine to the future survival and growth of Judaism and Jewish life everywhere. There have always been many Zionist "negaters of the *galut*," who despaired of the survival of Jewish life outside of Palestine. The recent resurgence of anti-Semitism in this country and the continued deterioration of Jewish life all over the United States has only intensified the anti-Diaspora complex of these Zionists.

The membership of the Z.O.A. has increased this year from 67,000 to 120,000. But, for the most part, these new members are dues-paying members who have little interest in Zionist ideology. They are willing to further the fundamental political purpose of the Z.O.A. and to contribute funds for the upbuilding of Palestine. They are willing to be counted in favor of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine, and they may have a pride in the achievements of the *yishuv* in Palestine, but Zionism and the Jewish Commonwealth have little meaning for them as Jews living in America.

The time has come to clarify the relation of Palestine to the Diaspora generally and more specifically to American Jewish life both for Zionists and non-Zionists. The imminence of the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine makes such a clarification imperative, because it has created ungrounded apprehension among the non-Zionists and confusion among the Zionists. The following then are the points which need reiteration or further clarification.

Palestine Indispensable to Jewish Survival and Growth

1. Without Palestine, there can be no survival and growth for Jewish life in the Diaspora. To be sure, in those lands of the Diaspora where the Jews have not been exterminated, Jewish life can continue to survive for decades and even for centuries. But under modern conditions, it will be impossible for the Jews to survive as a creative group without a center in Palestine. This remains true and will become increasingly evident even if one believes that Judaism is a religion and wants to propagate Reform or Orthodox or Conservative Judaism, or even if one believes that it is a secular "folkism" which is to be lived in the

* Paper read before the Annual Conference of the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, held in New York on June 30 and July 1.

** In collaboration with the members of the Policy Committee of the Conference, Mordecai M. Kaplan, Ira Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman and Eugene Kohn.

Diaspora. If we want Jewish life to survive and *grow,* if we want it to have some kinship to Jewish life everywhere, we need a center in Palestine. This is not a dogma of Zionism which loyal Zionists are asked to accept as a matter of unquestioning faith. It is a conviction which is the outgrowth of bitter experience and of historical insight. It is based on the record of the *yishuv,* its increasing influence upon Jewish life everywhere and the tragic events of the past five years.

We are a historic people. Our religion and culture derive from our peoplehood, from our history as a people. When we say that Zionism offers a "national solution," we do not necessarily mean that every Jew needs or must want a national solution. The reconstitution of Poland, France, Czechoslovakia and other nations will not solve all the problems of Poles, Frenchmen and Czechs everywhere, or even in their own countries. It will give the Poles as a whole, the French as a whole, the Czechs as a whole a new lease on life, a chance to survive as a group, to give collective expression to their culture and way of life. We want a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine for the same reason—to give the Jewish people as a collective group an opportunity to survive as a normal group and to give collective expression to their culture and attitude toward life.

Where Jews are not concerned, we are quick to emphasize the need for collective security, for a United States of Europe, for a world state, and denounce as isolationist any attempt to deal with the problems of peace and security in a piece-meal, fragmentary fashion. Zionism is an over-all view of the Jewish problem; it offers a solution to the problem of the survival and growth of the Jews as a group—but it does not assert or imply that every Jew must need or want a Zionist solution to his individual problem, though in the long run, the life of every Jew will be or should be affected by what happens in Palestine.

The Need of Implementing and Defining the Commonwealth Idea

2. Secondly we must strive to have the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine accepted by the nations of the world as *a concrete goal to be realized within a definite period of time.* Otherwise the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, the setting up of an effectively functioning Jewish group life, the ability of the *yishuv* to absorb "homeless" Jews who will want or need a home—all of these aims will be subject to hampering tactics and even to sabotage by the mandatory power or by other national groups with selfish interests of their own. This again is not a dogma which has been decreed by the Zionist hierarchy. It has been learned as a result of bitter experience. The very titles of the books on Palestine—Ziff's "The Rape of Palestine," Van Paassen's "The Forgotten Ally"—suggest the injustice and humiliation endured by the Jews in Palestine as a tolerated minority in a mandated territory.

Hair-splitting philosophers who make nice distinctions about the desirability and feasibility of a Jewish Commonwealth fail to reckon with the totality of the situation. They want the present *yishuv* to grow, to absorb all those refugees who either want to or have to emigrate to Palestine, to serve as a center of culture for the Jewish people. They want all these things, but do not see how even these ends will be thwarted unless there is an unequivocal declaration of intention by the United Nations as regards the future of Palestine.

We have already indicated that there are many aspects of the problem of the Jewish Commonwealth which need clarification by the Zionists. Is the Commonwealth to be conceived in the pattern of the republic of the United States in which equality of political status is given to individuals, but ethnic groups do not function as political units? Or is it to follow the pattern of the republic of Switzerland which is a federation of three cantons, each of different nationality, though sharing a common citizenship? Or shall it accept the constitution of Poland as its model and grant minority group rights to the Arab and the Christian populations? How will Palestine be governed as a "Jewish" Commonwealth? What will be done about the problem of language, schooling, etc.? There should be full and careful discussion of these and other problems and some formulation of policy on these questions should be promulgated.

The Jewish Commonwealth and A Democratic World Order

3. Thirdly, Palestine can have no future as a Jewish Commonwealth or in any other form, unless there is a world order in which the little nations as well as the little men will be able to live in security and peace and have access to the goods of the world. Zionist policy therefore cannot and must not ignore the larger problems of world security and peace and international organization. This point is so obvious that it does not have to be labored. Yet although official Zionist statesmen pay lip-service to the need for a free democratic world order, the future of Palestine is treated in isolation from the rest of the problem of world peace and security. As Zionists we cannot afford to ignore the larger issues and to let others think and decide for us.

World Jewry's Permanent Relation to the Jewish Commonwealth

4. Fourthly, it is necessary to clarify the relation of Jews throughout the world to Palestine, once a Jewish Commonwealth is established. The term "Jewish" is ambiguous, because it can be used in a national, in a religious, or in a racial sense. We want to convey by it the notion that the majority in the Commonwealth will be Jews, that the official language will be Jewish, that there the Jewish spirit will be afforded a normal opportunity to function in an environment of its own creation. The name *Palestine* is a foreign word, and Palestinian Jews do not like to be called "Palestinians." They prefer that the country be called *Eretz Yisrael* or *Judea.* But whatever it is to be called, it is clear that Jews in Palestine will be citizens of that country, and the only Jews entitled to call themselves members of the Jewish nation. Jews outside of Palestine will be citizens or "nationals" of the countries in which they dwell.

This does not mean that outside Palestine, Jews will be members only of a religious community — Americans or Frenchmen or Englishmen of the Mosaic faith. They will still be members of the Jewish people, of a historical people, the product not only of a geography but of a history. (The word "nationality" might be used in contrast to "nation"). Peoplehood connotes more than religion; it connotes a common language, a common literature, historic memories, common hopes and aspirations, a link with a land, as well as a common religion. Being a member of the Jewish people or nationality and a citizen of the American nation are in no way inconsistent; on the contrary, such multiple cultures add to the enrichment of American life. The fact that there are Jews who are citizens of a Jewish nation in a land of its own called "Eretz

Yisrael," "Judea" or "Palestine," need not affect the political and social status of the Jews here or anywhere else.

The Meaning of Zionism to American Jewish Life

5. Finally we must make clear the relation of American Jews to a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine. Zionism is a reaffirmation of the peoplehood or nationhood of Israel. Such reaffirmation was and is necessary in the face of the assertions of certain Jews that Judaism is a religion only, and in face of the paradoxical position of the Jewish people among the nations of the world. This implies that in America, too, we must cultivate and develop, insofar as possible, the things we have in common as a people, those things we have in common with Jews here, in Palestine and in other countries. What are the things we have in common? The Jewish religion, the Hebrew language and literature, the national folkways, the arts, education, recreation and fraternization. All this requires institutions and governing bodies, a community and a community organization.

Zionism and Palestine have already transformed American Jewish life—Jewish education, the arts, even the Synagogue. But we have only begun to realize the spiritual benefits which can accrue to Diaspora Jewry from a Jewish Palestine. What Palestine has done for us is only an earnest of what it can do, if we regard the stimulation of Jewish life everywhere as an objective of Zionism.

Naturally, certain aspects of Zionism and Palestine can affect only some Jews; other aspects can have meaning for all Jews. Only some American Jews will settle in Palestine. Others may be able to study there or live there for a while. Still others may be coopted for work there—doctors, engineers, educators, and the like. Many will be able to visit Palestine occasionally as tourists. Many more may be able to establish trade connections with Palestine or invest money in business and other enterprises there.

But for all Jews, Zionism can have definite meaning and significance. It can give every Jew status and dignity, the sense of belonging to a people started on a new and romantic career, of building a new type of commonwealth. It can give every Jew a share in this great task of rebuilding an ancient homeland. In contributing his money and his energy to the cause of Palestine, every Jew can feel that he is helping rebuild himself and his culture. For whatever is produced in Palestine will be the product of the thinking and striving of Diaspora Jewry and will in turn affect the character of Jewish culture in the Diaspora.

Zionism can infuse new spirit into the life of the American Jew. To the extent that he masters the Hebrew language, he can enjoy the literature and thought of the new national renaissance both in Palestine and the Diaspora. His prayers, the comprehension of Jewish tradition and literature will gain new meaning. He will have a new awareness of communal Jewish life and communal responsibility. He will be exposed to new ideas and to new experiences from the old-new land, which will broaden his vision, enrich his thinking, and contribute immeasurably to his growth both as Jew and American. And finally, Zionism should clarify for him his responsibility as an American. The fight for Zion and the task of building there a new civilization, the fight against intolerance and anti-Semitism here—is all one fight. For the virulence of anti-Semitism in any country or at any time is itself a gauge of unrest and uncertainty, and is itself a reflection that such hatreds persist, that dissatisfaction is rife, that there is work to be done—to remove injustice and discrimination, to bring nearer the day when the life abundant will

be within the reach of all, black and white and yellow, Jew and Gentile.

The Problem of Jewish Autonomy

Thus far we have dealt largely with the need for clarification of the political and relational implications of the Jewish Commonwealth. There is one aspect of the problem, however, which has been entirely ignored in discussions of the Jewish Commonwealth and about which little thinking has been done. That is the problem of internal Jewish autonomy, once a Jewish Commonwealth is established. This is a problem fraught with great significance, for it involves the whole question of church and state and other questions, which, if not solved satisfactorily, might even lead to voilence.

At the present time the administration of the country of Palestine is in British hands and problems involving taxation, banking, etc., are governed by a conglomeration of English common law, the old Turkish law of Palestine, British White Papers and decrees and ordinances, etc. However, in all matters involving personal status, exclusive jurisdiction is given to the Jewish, Moslem and seven Christian denominational courts. The jurisdiction of the courts extends only to nationals of Palestine and not to foreigners (except in the case of the Moslem court) in matters pertaining to marriage, divorce, probate of wills, succession, adoption of children and the like. The fact that these courts have no jurisdiction over foreigners causes hardship in many cases. Thus, no court in Palestine has the authority to dissolve marriages of foreigners.

The Jewish law which governs thse matters is, of course, traditional Jewish law, which in many instances is medieval and antiquated. Since the Rabbinical courts are part of *Keneset Yisrael,* all Palestinian Jews, even the *halutzim* in the *kevutzot,* for the most part, subject themselves, as a matter of discipline, to the jurisdiction of these courts. Although this is the official attitude of the Labor Group, in actual practice there are many individual Jews who simply disregard the Rabbinic law and live in violation of it, though the number of such individuals is becoming smaller as the self-discipline of the *yishuv* becomes firmer.

In addition to these Rabbinal courts there has grown up in Palestine a series of *Mishpat Hashalom* courts similar to our courts of arbitration to which Jews repair voluntarily for settlement of civil litigations. Since many problems arise which are not explicitly covered by traditional Jewish law, a great many decisions have had to be reached on the basis of common sense or on the basis of the experience of Jews in other lands. Hence a kind of common Palestinian Jewish civil law is in the process of development in these courts.

In addition to the Rabbinical courts and the *Mishpat Hashalom,* Jews have legislative jurisdiction in a number of the municipalities, which are governed by a Municipalities Ordinance law. On the basis of this law, Tel Aviv and other communities issue ordinances governing order and safety and the like. Tel Aviv must of necessity act in contravention of rabbinic authority in many cases, for it is not possible to apply traditional law to most of the public utilities without jeopardizing health and life.

What will happen when a Jewish Commonwealth is established? Presumably a Jewish legislative body will be set up which will have jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters. There will have to be laws regarding taxation, banking, corporations, the rights of women and a thousand and one other matters. Will the members of Agudat Israel and the Mizrachi,

for example, insist that Rabbinic law be followed, even where we know that, as in the case of laws regarding rights of women and laws of witnesses, Rabbinical law is medieval and discriminatory? Or let us assume that there will be no protest by Orthodox groups against setting up a legislative body which, while deriving most of its law from Rabbinic sources, will feel free to deviate from Rabbinic law when necessary, what, in that case, will happen to laws involving personal status, now under the jurisdiction of Rabbinical courts? Will these courts have the same authority as before? Will the labor groups, for example, once a Jewish legislative body is set up, be willing to continue to submit to these courts, or will they demand modernization of Rabbinic law in matters pertaining to personal status? There is no doubt that if there were only a Jewish community of Palestine to be dealt with, many Jews there would not readily submit to the jurisdiction of the Rabbinical courts. But there will be Arab and Christian communities as well which will demand and get continued control over the personal status of the members of their communities. In that case, it will not be easy to deny the same right to Rabbinical courts. But what is to prevent liberal Jews and Conservative Jews from demanding courts for themselves, just as the Christians have seven different denominational courts?

We are confronted here with a challenging and serious problem and with a historic opportunity. We are faced with one of the crucial questions of all modern nations—that of the relation of church and state, that of a democratic versus a theocratic government. Turkey became modernized as a result of the work of one man; Czechoslovakia, Republican Spain, other countries have been confronted with the same challenge and the same opportunity.

Preparing the Way for The Commonwealth

What we need is a Commission of Inquiry representative of all sections of Jewry to delve into this matter; to do research, conduct hearings, make a study of the experiences of other young modern nations, and ultimately to convoke a Constitutional Convention to overhaul Rabbinic law and make it a fit instrument for a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth.

The question can be asked: What has the problem of internal Jewish autonomy to do with Diaspora Jews? The answer is, first, that there is at present no Jewish Commonwealth, no fixed *yishuv*, relatively speaking. It is a *yishuv* in the process of becoming, a Commonwealth in the making, which is still dependent on the Diaspora for manpower and for resources. We Jews of the Diaspora have a real share in the emergent Jewish Commonwealth. It would be disastrous for the future development of the Jewish Commonwealth, if Jewish law had to develop within the confines of Rabbinic law as interpreted by the Agudat Israel or any other Orthodox group.

Then again this matter is of concern to us as Diaspora Jews, because what happens in Palestine is bound to affect Jewish law all over the world. A large portion of Jewish law has been inoperative for some time, and more of it is becoming inoperative from day to day. A progressive and progressing Jewish law in Palestine is bound to exert a revivifying influence on Jewish life and Jewish law everywhere. Diaspora Jewish law cannot stand still or lag behind Jewish law in Palestine without courting the danger of cutting itself off more and more from the future center of Jewish life. This is one of the areas of Jewish life which Jews everywhere, in Palestine and in the Dias-

pora, should cultivate in common.

With the establishment of the Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine, the Jewish people will be given a unique and historic opportunity to become not only autonomous but free, free to bring up to date its law, its government, its institutions. Let us prepare now for the day that will see the birth of a Jewish Commonwealth. And may it be sooner than we think!

DISCUSSION OF THE FOREGOING PAPER

Dr. Max Nussbaum of Los Angeles, California, was introduced and asked to lead in the discussion. He stated it as his opinion that the first section of the paper, dealing with the political status of Palestine after the war, could not profitably be discussed until after the expected issuance of a joint statement by Great Britain and the United States on the subject; that the last section, dealing with the problem of the internal organization of Palestine, need also not be discussed, since that was a problem which would settle itself as the country assumed the role of self-government; but that the middle section, dealing with the mutual relations of Palestine and the Diaspora, called for some comment.

What Jews all over the world need, he said, is definition and normalization of their status. Psychologically, the Jews, even in America, are uneasy because they feel insecure. That does not mean that Jews who live in America, Great Britain or any true democracy, are in "exile." The term "exile" can be applied only to the status of Jews in fascist countries or in countries where they are officially discriminated against, even though they may enjoy some political minority rights, as in Poland and Rumania. But even in democratic countries, Jews are at a disadvantage, although the democratic institutions of the country afford them a kind of second-class normalcy. In those countries Jews are a people with a minority culture living within a majority culture, but with full freedom and full citizenship. The only place, however, where full normalcy would prevail, where being a Jew would not constitute a handicap, would be in an autonomous Jewish Palestine. There Judaism would have the status not of a minority but of a majority culture. The importance of having one place where the Jews and Judaism are not at a disadvantage vis-a-vis other elements of the population is apparent when we consider the psychological effect which the possession of a national home in Eire has on Irishmen in America. They are free from the sense of inferiority and self-hate from which American Jews suffer. They point with pride to the life that goes on in Ireland as representative of what they stand for as a group. They may not live in Ireland, but they are a normal people, because, like all other peoples, they have a land to which they can point as the evidence of their peoplehood, the expression of its spirit, the locale of its civilization. If Jews had a free Commonwealth in Palestine, it would similarly affect the spirit of Jews everywhere. They would no longer feel obliged to justify to their neighbors their very right to exist. Palestine would speak for them. They would be accepted as the people whose culture is that of a known and recognized nation in Palestine. The Diaspora Jew would feel himself a normal person.

Dr. Kaplan dissented from the view that the internal problem of Palestine would be one which would settle itself and needed no present study nor any intervention by Diaspora Jewry. He agreed with Dr. Nussbaum that a flourishing Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine would normalize the psychology of the Jew in a way similar to the normalizing influence of the Irish state on the Irish people everywhere. But before Palestine can function for the Jews in the same way that Ireland functions for the Irish, it is necessary to solve the internal problems referred to in Dr. Dinin's paper. The Irish can look to Ireland as an example of what the Irish people are like where they can live together in freedom. That is because the Irish have always constituted the majority population in Ireland and all that was needed was to free them from foreign domination. But the Jews of Palestine come from different countries, have different and irreconcilable views of what constitutes the essential character of Jewish nationhood, and have had little or no experience in democratic processes of compromise and social adjustment. How then can the Jews of America look to Palestine for an example of the normal pattern of Jewish life, when Palestine Jewry itself does not yet know what the normal pattern of that life is to be? As long as Palestine is under a Mandate, the different irreconcilable groups can each go its own way and depend on the mandatory power to keep the peace between them and protect each group in its rights. But, with the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth, these groups will have to work together. Neither rebellion nor secession of irreconcileable elements can be countenanced by a state. The attempt to lay the spiritual and organizational foundations for cooperation of all the

various elements in the population of Palestine, Jewish and Gentile, cannot be begun too soon, if we wish to be prepared for statehood in Palestine such as we have asked for.

Rabbi Soltes asked Dr. Kaplan whether he advocated deferment of the establishment of the Jewish Commonwealth until such time as Palestine Jewry had solved the internal conflicts between the various religious and ideological groups. Dr. Kaplan replied that that was not what he meant. People cannot demonstrate a capacity for self-government until they are given the responsibility of self-government. But he believed that it was in the interest of the success of the Commonwealth project for the leaders now to anticipate the situation that will confront them and to prepare to meet it.

Mr. Peretz asked Dr. Nussbaum whether American Jews should consider themselves in *galut*. Dr. Nussbaum replied that he had already indicated that the term *galut* is not applicable to the status of American Jews. He further clarified his view of the relation of American Jewry to Palestine by saying that the Jews in America and throughout the world constitute a people but not a nation in the political sense of the term. Only the Jews of Palestine would, once the Jewish Commonwealth is established, be citizens of the Jewish nation. But in America, Jewish peoplehood would express itself in the cultivation of Jewish culture by Jews in addition to their participation in American culture. Jewish life in America would thus be profoundly influenced by Palestine, since in Palestine Jewish culture would have the opportunity of free development with all the advantages that cultures of majority groups have in all democratic countries. For this reason he took issue with Dr. Kaplan, who, in the afternoon's discussion on the *mitzvot ma-asiyot,* had expressed the need of American Jewry's influencing the religious life in Palestine. Since religion, like every other aspect of Jewish civilization would have its maximum opportunity for free development in Palestine, Dr. Nussbaum held that we must look to Palestine to bring religion to the Jewry of the Diaspora rather than receiving religion from it.

Dr. Kaplan, however, felt that a misunderstanding had arisen with regard to his views on the relative role of Western Jewry and of Palestine in Jewish religious development. He did not mean to imply that religion must come to Palestine from America and other Western democracies, but rather that the attitude to religion must. It is a basic sociological law that, for people to have religion in common, they must have other interests in common. That is why Palestine is essential for the future of Jewish religion, because it affords the greatest number of interests that Jews have in common. One's attitude toward religion is frequently derived from a different environment from that which is the source of one's religion itself. For example, said Dr. Kaplan, I got my religion from my family but my attitude came from study, experience, experimentation. There will certainly be religion in Palestine, but the attitude toward it will have to come from the best in Western civilization. Palestine is a pioneering country. Its present inhabitants are too preoccupied with innumerable practical problems arising from immediate economic and political needs to be able to give sufficient attention to thinking through the problem of the adjustment of the religious tradition to the conditions of modern life in a democratic commonwealth. In this respect the situation is very similar to that which confronted the founders of the Second Jewish Commonwealth in the 5th century B.C.E. Then, too, it was from a country, where an established economy afforded opportunities for reflective thinking, from Babylon, that Ezra the Scribe was able to bring a new attitude to Jewish religion which gave it the direction that it continued to pursue throughout the Rabbinic period. Ezra could not have accomplished what he did accomplish for Jewish religion had he remained in Babylon, but neither could Palestinian Jewry have become the center from which Torah was brought to the whole Diaspora had not Ezra brought from Babylon to the struggling Jewish community, the doctrines which it needed for its religious development.

It is asking too much of Palestinian Jewry to expect it to solve the problem of the relation of Church and State with which the world has been grappling ever since the Renaissance and which has not been fully solved even in America, as is evidenced in the repeated demands for religious education in the public schools. Yet an attitude to that problem must be developed if the different religious and ideological groups of the Palestinian population are to live peaceably together. Guidance toward a solution of that problem can come best from the Jews of those Western democracies where democratic procedures and the habit of tolerant recognition of religious and political differences have found their highest development. With such guidance, said Dr. Kaplan, I have faith enough to believe Palestinian Jewry can evolve a modus operandi which may provide a universal solution to the problem of the relation of Church and State.

Dr. David Tannenbaum said that he did not share Dr. Kaplan's apprehensions. He deprecated the attempt to plan the future of Palestine from America. He thought that we

could build the Commonwealth by the instrumentalities which exist in Palestine today. As for religion, its symbols and values would not be the same in Palestine and the Diaspora because of the differences in prevailing conditions.

The discussion was concluded by Dr. Ira Eisenstein who pointed out two fallacies that had cropped up in the course of the discussion. The first was the assumption that Palestine was the concern only of the Jews who lived there and that the Jewry of the Diaspora had no right to attempt to influence its development. The job of building the national home of the Jewish people is a job for *all* the people. Every Jew has a stake in the land and is entitled to a voice in determining the character of its life, its social and religious institutions. The second error proceeded from using the term religion in the conventional sense which identifies it almost entirely with ritual and worship. In America, Jewish religion is almost confined to those areas. But in Palestine, religious law controls all matters of personal status: marriage, divorce, probate of wills, etc. All these fall under the jurisdiction of the Rabbinical courts. There is even now a struggle for power between the religious and the secularist groups. Moreover the religious organizations are Orthodox and do not recognize the legitimacy of any non-Orthodox religious groups. Hence, when the autonomous state is reached, there are bound to be grave curtailments of liberty and bitter and perhaps violent conflicts, unless the problem of establishing unity and tolerance of diversity is fully provided for by careful planning.

Book Notes

EDUCATION FACES THE FUTURE, by I. B. Berkson, Harper Bros., New York, 1943, 345 *pp.*

The challenge of dictatorship and the advent of the Second World War have led to a reconsideration and reaffirmation of the methods and doctrines of liberalism. *Education Faces the Future* is an exposition as well as a critical revaluation of the liberal tradition in American education from the standpoint of what the author calls the needs of an "interdependent and organic society." In a period of conflict and upheaval, Dr. Berkson is in quest of the values of unity and certainty. His "new" liberalism envisions organized religion as a unifying force and as supplying a common ethic for individual and social life.

The "disunity" and "strife" which Dr. Berkson perceives in the social scene is paralleled also in the sphere of education. Dr. Berkson is disturbed by the current conflict of educational philosophies, by the diversity of opinion and practice and by "the lack of a unifying principle" and "clearly stated aims." Underlying the educational controversy, Dr. Berkson sees the symptoms of moral and intellectual "confusion," even of spiritual disintegration. Faith in the method of intelligence, in the efficacy of change and inevitable progress, has given way, it appears, to profound disillusionment. Even the belief in liberalism and in democracy has "ceased to inspire the devotion of the new generation."

Dr. Berkson connects the current "crisis" in democracy with the empiricism and relativism in liberal thinking. His criticism of liberal democracy follows the conventional arguments. Traditional liberalism has set up a false opposition between liberty and authority, freedom and discipline, and has emphasized those forces that make for freedom and change to the exclusion of those that make for security and stability. The proponents of liberalism were not attentive enough "to the struggle in the soul between the powers of light and darkness, between the forces of good and evil." Liberalism failed

to note the "insights embedded in folk proverbs, religious rituals, and ethical imperatives." Individualistic liberalism undervalued the importance of established institutions in failing to realize "how much of the rational element in life is incorporated in social forms, in institutions, customs and the mores," and in failing to realize "that men have need also of an association that goes beyond the communal attachment and of seeing life in the perspective of a universal frame of reference." And finally, liberalism has fostered "a philosophic neutralism," which stimulates endless inquiry, "without coming to any result."

Dr. Berkson is critical of both the empiricism of the relativist and the dogmatism of the absolutist. "The experimentalist method is not in any genuine sense applicable to social affairs." And, "experimentation," he writes, "gives a false impression of constant change and lack of a framework of permanent values." The intellectualism of men like Dewey, Dr. Berkson complains, gives us nothing to hold on to except the bare methods of reflective inquiry. "The Dewey analysis of the act of thought reflects needs of an era of liberalism which was concerned with release from the fixed traditions of the past. Our own age requires a different stress, not so much liberation from old dogmas as a clear definition of purposes for which to strive."

On the other hand, Dr. Berkson warns us that the source of values is not to be found in the methods of intuitive knowledge or in universal truths independent of human experience and social needs. There is to be no return to "unchanging, fixed, and final ends." Nor does a return to inward spiritual values wholly satisfy the quest for the "unity of life." For spiritual life is also "a form of individualism, refined and cultured individualism but individualism nevertheless." Ideals, we are told, must be related to the facts of time and place and "they must be checked by consequences resulting from their application."

The author pleads for an education philosophy that is to be conceived as a "way of life," i.e., as an ethical system. The concept "way of life" implies "a system of ideal values" and stresses the significance of ideas and ideals in clarifying and unifying the educational program. "All ways of life," the author writes, "are universal in tendency, they transcend the confines of any particular community, and they reflect the aspirations of mankind, as a whole."

Dr. Berkson sees a "new intellectual and moral synthesis" already in the making. The "new" outlook represents in part "a return to old ideas and values deeply embedded in our cultural and religious tradition." There is a return to the recognition of the place of the church, the family and the nation, "for the maintenance and implementation of values, for the development of communal loyalties, and for the deepening and enlargement of personality that results from participation in the organized forms of social life." The "new" mental climate is favorable to the recognition of the power of ideas and beliefs in control of the life of the individual and society." Liberals as well as Conservatives are recognizing "that the traditional heritage is the source of our values, of truth and justice, love and mercy, reason and freedom." And further, "In the western religious tradition is enshrilned the aspiration of a free and equal, of a fraternal society." "Organized religion is custodian of the vision of peace through justice."

The "new" liberalism of Dr. Berkson is an effort to achieve a synthesis of "the ethical idea in the religious traditions of Western Civilization" with the "humanistic liberalism of the 18th cen-

tury," and the "social realism" of an age of science. The traditional heritage supplies the abiding norms and is the source of values. On the other hand, in social and economic planning, the author sees the need for systematic use of intelligence, scientific experimentation, and the "engineering attitude of mind." In the planned employment of resources of science and of the forces of production, Dr. Berkson sees the "culmination of the denial of supernaturalism" and a denial of "miracles and dependence on chance."

The "synthesis" proposed by the author rests, it seems, on a separation between values set up as ends and the methods of science which are regarded as instrumental. If Dr. Berkson's values are the product of experience and are not to be found in ultra-human sources or in the methods of intuitive knowledge, in what sense can these values be regarded as ends? And if Dr. Berkson regards science as the systematic use of intelligence and as an agent of social progress, why does he confine science to mere means? One would have liked to see a clearer statement on the relationship of means to ends. Nevertheless Dr. Berkson has made a courageous effort to find the common ground for an adequate social and educational philosophy. Underlying the whole approach is the conviction that the quest for certainty is not the pursuit of a mere illusion.

Alexander Brody

REALITIES AND VALUES

(*Continued from page* 9)

immigration schedule. The fact is that the refugees are interned, will remain only for the duration, and are to be returned to their lands as soon as possible. For political candidates to fall to such levels of callousness and heartlessness deserves the censure of any journal, Jewish or non-Jewish, religious or secular. The fact that Mr. Bricker was one of the governors signing the appeal for the establishment of the temporary refugee havens makes his assertions all the more censurable.

▼

IN OUR LAST ISSUE, A SERIOUS injustice was committed against Rabbi Beryl D. Cohon of Brookline, Mass. We quoted a statement made by Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, of Boston University, from the pulpit of Temple Sinai, to the effect that he "expected to live to see the day when Jews would become a Protestant group"; and we concluded that Rabbi Cohon had not only condoned the statement, but applauded it. This was wholly incorrect. Dr. Marsh had abused the privilege of the pulpit, and Rabbi Cohon repudiated the statement on Rosh Hashanah, his first opportunity to do so. We apologize to Rabbi Cohon for the unjust inference drawn from news dispatches which told only part of the story.

▼

DELEGATES TO THE AMERICAN Jewish Conference are meeting in many sections of the country with electors from their districts, to discuss the main issues confronting the forthcoming Conference sessions. This should go a long way toward clarifying some of the problems to which we have referred in an editorial published in our last issue. We hope that the delegates will discuss among themselves, and with the representatives of local community organizations, not only the Palestine and European scene, and what can be done for fellow-Jews, but the American scene, and what can be done for ourselves, for our communal organizations, our schools, our synagogues, our homes and our inter-faith and interracial affairs.